

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration, reexamination, and allowance of the present patent application are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication, at page 5 of the Office Action, that the subject matter of Claims 1-5, 7-10, 12, 13, 19-21, 23-29, 33, and 34 contain allowable subject matter.

Summary of Office Action

In the Office Action, beginning at page 2, claims 1 and 5 are objected to. Claims 14, 15, 22, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,666,567 to Feldman (the Feldman'567 patent). In addition, claims 16, 17, and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over the Feldman'567 patent. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over the Feldman'567 patent in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0093820 to Pederson (the Pederson'820 publication).

Summary of Response to Office Action

By this Amendment, claims 14, 22, 30-32, and 34 are amended, claim 33 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and dependent claims 35 and 36 are added. Claims 1-5, 7-10, 12-32 and 34-36 remain pending in this application, with claims 1, 5 and 14 being the only independent claims.

The Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 14, 15, 22, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the Feldman'567 patent. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, and requests reconsideration for the following reasons.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication that claim 33 includes allowable subject matter. Accordingly, by this Amendment, claims 14 has been amended to include those features from claim 33 that are indicated as being allowable. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14 is respectfully requested.

Because claims 15, 22, and 32 depend from and respectively incorporate all the features of claim 14, claims 15, 22, and 32 are also not anticipated by the Feldman'567 patent at least for the above reasons for which claim 14 is not anticipated, and for the separate and distinct features that they recite.

Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of all claims 14, 15, 22, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn for at least the above-noted reasons.

In the Office Action, claims 16, 17, and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over the Feldman'567 patent. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and Applicant requests reconsideration for at least the following reasons.

As indicated above, the allowable features of claim 33 are now included in claim 14. Accordingly, because claims 16, 17, and 30-32 depend from claim 14, they are also allowable for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 14. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 16, 17, and 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the Feldman'567 patent be withdrawn for at least the above-noted reasons.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over the Feldman'567 patent in view of the Pederson'820 publication. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and

Applicant requests reconsideration for at least the following reasons.

Because claim 18 depends from and includes all the features of independent claim 14, claim 18 is also allowable for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 14. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Feldman'567 patent in view of the Pederson'820 publication be withdrawn for at least the above-noted reasons.

Claims 1 and 5 are objected to for allegedly failing to provide antecedent basis for the feature of "a given ridgeline." This objection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

It is respectfully submitted that antecedent basis is not necessary for the "ridgeline" in claims 1 and 5 because it is the first time that this feature is recited. The article "a" is used before the term "given ridgeline" in both claims 1 and 5. In addition, claims 1 and 5 define the ridgeline at least with respect to the LED elements. For example, claims 1 and 5 recite "the LED elements are arranged along a given ridgeline." Therefore, there is a structural relationship provided between the given ridgeline and other structures of the claimed invention, as required.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that "applicant has previously recited in claim one that all the LED elements are arranged adjacent the base." Applicant respectfully submits that this statement is in error. Nowhere in claim 1 does Applicant require that "all the LED elements are arranged adjacent the base." Only open-ended "comprising-type" claim language has been used to describe the LED elements.

In view of the above-arguments, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 5 are in compliance with standard U.S. patent claim drafting practice. Withdrawal of the objection to the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the present patent application is in condition for allowance at least for the reasons stated above. In addition, while the claimed combinations are patentable over the cited art for the reasons presented by the Examiner in the January 29, 2007

Office Action, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed combinations are patentable for many different and/or additional reasons. More specifically, the patentability of the claimed combinations is not limited to (nor necessarily relies on) the particular subset of features identified in the Examiner's Statement, but rather it is the entire combination of elements and/or steps in the claims, each taken as a whole, that are patentable over the prior art, both taken alone and in hypothetical combination. An early indication of the allowability of this patent application is therefore respectfully solicited.

If the patent Examiner believes that a telephone conference with the undersigned would expedite passage of this patent application to issue, she is invited to call on the number below.

It is not believed that extensions of time are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in accompanying documents. If, however, additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge fees necessitated by this paper, and to credit all refunds and overpayments, to the Deposit Account listed on the original application transmittal papers filed in this application.

Respectfully submitted,
Cermak & Kenealy LLP

By:  /djkl
David J. Kenealy
Registration No. 40,411

U.S.P.T.O. Customer Number 39083
Cermak & Kenealy LLP
515 E. Braddock Rd., Suite B
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
703.778.6610 (v)
703.652.5101 (f)
Date: June 13, 2007